

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1 and 3-20 are pending in the application with claims 15-20 being new.

Claim Rejections under § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §03(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,966,121 to Hubbell et al. (Hubbell) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,812 to Hurtado et al. (Hurtado). This rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, for at least the reasons outlined below.

Independent claim 1 is amended and, as amended recites an apparatus comprising (emphasis added):

- memory; and
- logic operatively coupled to the memory and operatively configurable to access multimedia content from a medium, the logic providing a multimedia navigator program, a control application programming interface (API) and an information API, the control and information API's being configured to respond to flags that selectively determine if at least one operation will be conducted, the operation being selected from a group of operations that includes a player-navigator synchronization operation, a selective interactive user operation, and a read/write register operation, the player-navigator synchronization operation comprising:
 - causing a multimedia player application to output a request command to the navigator program;
 - causing the multimedia navigator program to subsequently return to the player application: (i) an event identifier notifying the multimedia player application when the requested command is completed and (ii) a status result indicating whether the requested command succeeded or failed, such that the multimedia player application is able to track the event identifier to the requested

command output by the player application facilitating multiple instance tracking; and

- ***notifying the player application, by returning a canceled request command message from the multimedia navigator program, of every request command that is canceled by the multimedia content or by user action.***

In making out the rejection of claim 1, the Office argues that its subject matter is obvious over Hubbell in view of Hurtado. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, claim 1 has been amended to recite “an apparatus comprising...notifying the player application, by returning a canceled request command message from the multimedia navigator program, of every request command that is canceled by the multimedia content or by user action.” Applicant submits that the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to this claim.

Specifically, the Office’s *prima facie* case of obviousness fails for at least the reason that the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of this claim’s recited features. Namely, the cited references do not disclose “notifying the player application, by returning a canceled request command message from the multimedia navigator program, of every request command that is canceled by the multimedia content or by user action.”

To assist the Office in appreciating the claimed subject matter, the Office is referred to the following excerpt from Applicant’s specification:

Applicant’s Specification (pages 10-11)

As will be described in greater detail below, DVD2 API 108a-b adds flexible synchronization mechanisms for the application to know the completion status of requests made to the DVD Navigator 106. The new command completion notification allows the application to concurrently perform other tasks and be informed of the status of a previous request. Previous

DVD APIs assumed that either the application would be blocked until the request was completed, or would not send any notification to the application. Applications now have the option of receiving a synchronization object that they can use to wait on or are notified about completion events.

The synchronization mechanism also returns the status of the request that indicates whether it succeeded or returns the reason (an error code) for its failure. Previous DVD APIs would appear to successfully execute requests that would later fail due to changed state when the DVD Navigator 106 actually started processing them. At that point, there was no way to propagate the error indication back to the player application 102. The new mechanism also notifies the player application 102 of every request that is cancelled or overridden by the disc's program 112 or by further user actions.

However, neither Hubbell nor Hurtado teach or suggest such a synchronization mechanism.

Hubbell is directed to a hypervideo editing system including a wordprocessing system and a separate video playback system. Hubbell describes that an author of a hypervideo application identifies particular frames of the video displayed by the video playback system and creates a mark video file that defines the type and functional characteristics of various hypervideo controls, marks, and actions using the wordprocessing system. (Col. 3, lines 11-16.) In addition, Hubbell discloses “hypervideo controls that may be defined to exhibit time-dependent transition characteristics that visually convey the current availability and impending unavailability of the user-actuatable controls during predefined portions of a multimedia presentation.” (Col. 4, lines 46-50.) However, Hubbell

has not been shown to disclose, teach, or suggest “notifying the player application, by returning a canceled request command message from the multimedia navigator program, of every request command that is canceled by the multimedia content or by user action.”

Hurtado is cited for teaching API’s which process tools called to or handling processing calls or requested commands. *See* Office Action page 6. However, Hurtado fails to remedy the deficiencies in Hubbell noted above with respect to claim 1. Hurtado fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “notifying the player application, by returning a canceled request command message from the multimedia navigator program, of every request command that is canceled by the multimedia content or by user action.” as recited by claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Hubbell in view of Hurtado whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that the documents can even be combined).

Claims 3-5, 7-8, and 12-14 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for the additional features that each recite.

Claims 6 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being obvious over Hubbell in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,933,394 (Kim). This rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, for at least the reasons outlined below.

Dependent claims 6 and 9-10 depend from independent claim 1 and therefore include all the features of its respective base claim. As discussed above, Hubbell lacks features of independent claim 1.

Claims 6 and 9-10 are rejected in further view of Kim. Kim is cited for its alleged teaching of a DVD having DVD formatted content and a navigator which enables extraction of cell information. *See*, Office Action, page 6. However, Kim fails to remedy the deficiencies in Hubbell noted above with respect to claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 6 and 9-10 are allowable over the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that the documents can even be combined).

In addition, new dependent claims 15-20 depend from independent claim 1 and therefore include all of the features of claim 1. As such, claims 15-20 are allowable by virtue of their dependency, as well as for the additional features that each recite.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a call to discuss any remaining issues.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: December 26, 2007

By: /Emmanuel A. Rivera/

Emmanuel Rivera
Reg. No. 45,760
(509) 324-9256